



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,269	04/25/2001	Carl A. Gunter	53087-5007	5605

28977 7590 12/31/2003

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2921

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,269

Applicant(s)

GUNTER ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-6
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 10-16, 18, 19, 25-27, 29, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vance et al. ("Vance", US 6,411,605) in view of King et al. ("King", US 5,872,841).

As per independent claim 1, Vance teaches a method for automatically generating a list of participants physically present at a meeting, and distributing permission to at least one of the participants, comprising the steps of:

storing the identity and key information in one or more collection/distribution devices (col. 4, line 54); and

distributing permission to access a service to said at least one of the participants over at least one second personal area network using the one or more collection/distribution devices (col. 2, lines 41-52) wherein the permission is represented using a digital signature (col. 2, lines 41-44).

Vance does not disclose collecting identity and key information from at least one of the participants using at least one first personal area network. King discloses the agent module obtains the identity of the parties for the conference at col. 11, lines 33-34. It would have been

Art Unit: 2174

obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from King of obtaining the identity of the parties for the conference in Vance's system since it would allow the system collects the user information without explicitly asking for it.

As per claims 2 and 3, which are both dependent on claim 1, since the modified Vance's system is the personal area networks, it is inherent that the first personal area network and the second personal area network can be both the same and different.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, wherein said permission comprises authority to delegate one or more further permissions to one or more subsequent delegates (col. 2, lines 41-44).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Vance teaches the service comprises accessing content (col. 5, lines 19-38).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Vance teaches the service comprises actuating a device (12 of fig. 1).

As per independent claim 12, Vance teaches a graphical user interface on a delegation device comprising:

an access control matrix wherein said access control matrix comprises

Art Unit: 2174

one or more subject display areas for displaying subject information regarding one or more subjects physically present at a meeting (fig. 4) whom identity and key information is stored on the delegation device (col. 4, line 54);

one or more object display areas for displaying object information relating to one or more permissions to access a service wherein said permissions are distributed to said one or more subjects over at least one second personal area network using the delegation device and wherein the permissions are represented using a digital signature (fig. 5 - fig. 9; and col. 2, lines 52);

one or more association display areas for displaying association information of said one or more subjects to said one or more objects (fig. 10).

Vance does not disclose the one more subject whom identity and key information has been collected using at least one first personal area network. King discloses the agent module obtains the identity of the parties for the conference at col. 11, lines 33-34. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from King of obtaining the identity of the parties for the conference in Vance's system since it would allow the system collects the user information without explicitly asking for it.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claims 15 and 16, which are both dependent on claim 12, Vance teaches the one or more association display areas comprises one or more access control display areas and one or more capabilities display areas (fig. 10).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 12, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 12, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per independent claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 32; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

3. Claims 4, 17, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vance in view of King and further in view of Robinson et al. ("Robinson", US 6,577,949).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, modified Vance does not disclose the one or more collection/distribution devices comprise a personal digital assistant. Robinson discloses that at col. 7, lines 9-23. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Robinson of comprising a personal digital assistant in modified's Vance's collection/distribution devices since personal digital assistant is wireless, compact and portable device.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 12, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

Art Unit: 2174

4. Claims 6-9, 20-24, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vance in view of King.

As per claims 6-9, which are all dependent on claim 1, modified Vance does not disclose the first and second personal area network comprises two or more devices that transmit data by infrared light waves and short-range radio waves. The Examiner takes Official Notice that infrared light waves and short-range radio waves are well known in wireless art, which is widely used in laptop computers and cellular phones. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use infrared light waves and short-range radio waves in modified Vance's system since it would allow the system to implement wireless technology.

As per independent claim 20, Vance teaches a graphical user interface on a delegation device comprising:

one or more subject display areas for displaying subject information regarding one or more subjects physically present at a meeting (fig. 4) whom identity and key information is stored on the delegation device (col. 4, line 54);

one or more object display areas for displaying object information relating to one or more permissions to access a service wherein said permissions are distributed to said one or more subjects over at least one second personal area network using the delegation device and wherein the permissions are represented using a digital signature (fig. 5 - fig. 9; and col. 2, lines 52);

one or more association display areas for displaying association information of said one or more subjects to said one or more objects (fig. 10).

Art Unit: 2174

Vance does not disclose the one more subject whom identity and key information has been collected using at least one first personal area network. King discloses the agent module obtains the identity of the parties for the conference at col. 11, lines 33-34. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from King of obtaining the identity of the parties for the conference in Vance's system since it would allow the system collects the user information without explicitly asking for it.

Modified Vance does not disclose one or more movable subject and object icons are used in place of one or more subject and object display areas, respectively. The Examiner takes Official Notice that movable icons, which are used to represent data or information, are well known in the computer art, such as Window operating system. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use movable icons in modified Vance's system since it would allow displaying several icons in the same display window.

As per claims 21 and 22, which are both dependent on claim 20, since the modified Vance's system is the personal area networks, it is inherent that the first personal area network and the second personal area network can be both the same and different.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 20, Vance teaches the service comprises accessing content (col. 5, lines 19-38).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 20, Vance teaches the service comprises actuating a device (12 of fig. 1).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 25, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6567075 B1 to Baker, Albert D. et al. discloses feature access control in a display-based terminal environment.

US 6031904 A to An, Yafan et al. discloses service order mechanism for telephone subscriber.

US 5689642 A to Harkins, Larry E. et al. discloses recipient prioritized communication channel profiles.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquiries

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
December 24, 2003



